

EVALUATION CRITERIA
FY 2012 CALL FOR PROPOSALS SUPPORTING NOAA'S MISSION GOALS USING
UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS (UAS) TECHNOLOGY

Appendix B.1- INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Please provide both written comments and a summary rating on the Proposal Evaluation Form by employing the criteria provided below.

Proposal Evaluation Criteria:

We ask reviewers to use the following five criteria when evaluating a proposal:

- 1. Importance and/or Relevance and applicability of proposed project to the program goals: (35 percent):** This ascertains whether there is intrinsic value in the proposed work and /or relevance to NOAA, federal, regional, state or local activities. For the purposes of this competition, successful responses to this solicitation, investigations must be relevant to the science priorities, goals, and objectives of NOAA's Next Generation Strategic Plan. This should include an assessment of whether the research addresses documented end user needs, and evaluation of information and technology transfer plans and activities. A significant component of this criterion includes the degree to which the proposed work will develop outcomes leading to improved environmental, management practices.

- 2. Technical/scientific merit (35 percent):** This assesses whether the approach is technically sound and/or innovative, if the methods are appropriate, and whether there are clear project goals and objectives. For the purposes of this competition, successful responses to this solicitation must specify and justify the scientific scope and objectives of the proposed investigation, the full instrument suite to be assembled, the investigation platform and any upgrades, and the experimental approach to be pursued for data acquisition as well as for scientific analysis. Proposals should identify required analysis and or results to demonstrate advances in technology readiness levels.

- 3. Overall qualifications of applicant (15 percent):** This ascertains whether the applicant possesses the necessary education, experience, training, facilities, and administrative resources to accomplish the project. For the purposes of this competition, successful responses to this solicitation do not need to have previous experience with UAS but should be familiar with the particular field of study. Partnership with other investigators familiar with UAS operations is recommended, and includes the capability of the investigator and collaborators to complete the proposed work as evidenced by past research accomplishments, previous cooperative work, timely communication, and the sharing of findings, data, and other research products.

- 4. Project costs (15 percent):** The budget is evaluated to determine if it is realistic and commensurate with the project needs and time-frame. For the purposes of this competition, no single funding request will be considered in excess of \$300K.

Ranking should take the form of written comments on the above criteria, with an overall rating having the following characteristics:

- **Excellent:** Probably will fall among the top 10% of proposals in the subfield; highest priority for support. This category should be used only for truly outstanding proposals.
- **Very Good:** Probably will fall among the top 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should be supported.
- **Good:** Probably will fall among the middle 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; worthy of support.
- **Fair:** Probably will fall among the lowest 1/3 of proposals in the subfield; should not be supported without serious revision.
- **Poor:** Proposal has serious deficiencies; should not be supported.

Appendix B.2 - PANEL REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

A. Proposal Information:

Principal Investigator:	Panelist ID:
Institution:	Proposal Number:
Proposal Title:	

B. Proposal Evaluation:

For details see “Instructions for Reviewers.” Note: boxes will adjust in size as appropriate.

Please evaluate this proposal using the following five criteria.
1. Importance and/or Relevance and applicability of proposed project to the program goals: (XX percent):
2. Technical/scientific merit (XX percent):
3. Overall qualifications of applicant (XX percent):
4. Project costs (XX percent):
5. Other (XX percent):
Additional Comments:
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (5) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (4) <input type="checkbox"/> Good (3) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (2) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (1)
Verbatim but anonymous copies of reviews, ratings, and associated correspondence will be sent to the principal investigator. Subject to this policy and applicable laws, including the Freedom of Information Act (USC 552), reviewers’ comments and identities will be given maximum protection from disclosure.